

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/797,598	03/11/2004	Ingvar Sjoqvist	19200-000033/US	3900
7590 09/19/2007			EXAMINER .	
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 8910			OLANIRAN, FATIMAT O	
Reston, VA 20195			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2609	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/19/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/797,598	SJOQVIST, INGVAR			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Fatimat O. Olaniran	2609			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☒ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 11 March 2004 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner	a) accepted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obje	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date All.	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dai 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: line 31 and 33, "said auditory canal" lacks antecedent basis. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmer et al (6920228) in view of Sato (6721433).

Claim 1 Redmer discloses, ear protector arranged to protect a first ear and a second ear from loud noise, comprising a bow which has a first part connecting a second part and a third part, (Fig. 3 12: first part, 50: second and third part)

said second part comprising at least a first contact point to be applied in proximity to said first ear (Fig.3 part 50) said third part comprising at least a first contact point to be applied in proximity to said second ear (Fig. 3 part: 50),

characterized in that

the ear protector comprises a fourth part (Fig. 3 part: 52) on said second part and comprising a first ear plug (Fig. 3 part 54) which fits into said first ear to suppress noise (col. 4 line 31-34),

the ear protector comprises a fifth part (Fig. 3 part: 52) on said third part and comprising a second ear plug (Fig. 3 part 54) which fits into said second ear to suppress noise (col. 4 line 31-34)

said fourth part is designed to be able to assume a first position in which said ear plug is in a position outside said first ear (col. 3 line 25-28, when headset is removed from head), and a second position in which said ear plug is in a position which fits in said ear in order thereby to suppress noise (col. 4 line 31-34).

said fifth part is designed to be able to assume a first position in which said ear plug is in a position outside said auditory canal (col. 3 line 25-28), and a second position in which said ear plug is in a position in said auditory canal in order thereby to suppress noise (col. 4 line 31-34).

Redmer does not disclose part arranged rotatably.

Sato discloses part arranged rotatably (abstract line 11-14,Fig. 4, part 15 and 17). Therefore it would be obvious one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the ear-clip and ear buds of Redmer with the rotational feature of Sato so that the user could release the ear buds from the ears temporarily one at a time or both at the same time while the headset is still on the head as taught by Sato (col. 2 line 21-23).

Claim 2 analyzed with respect to claim 1, Redmer discloses said fourth and fifth parts fit into a respective auditory canal of the respective said ear (col. 4 line 31-32, 37-39).

Claim 3 analyzed with respect to claim 1, Redmer discloses, said second and third parts are arranged to pass round the pinna of an ear (Fig. 2 col. 3 line 30-32) and in this way hold said ear protector securely in a position such that said fourth and fifth parts, in the respective second position, fit said ear plugs into said auditory canals (col. 4 line 31-32, 37-39).

Claim 7 analyzed with respect to claim 1, Redmer discloses, in which said ear protector comprises a radio, mobile telephone, pager or other electronic equipment (col. 4 line 58-60) and devices for conveying sound or a signal in an audible manner through said ear plugs (col. 3 line 66-67 and col. 4 line 1-2).

Claim 8 analyzed with respect to claim 1, Redmer discloses, in which said ear plugs can be exchanged from said fourth and fifth parts (col. 4 line 31-33).

4. Claims 4-6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Redmer et al (6920228) in view of Sato (6721433) in further view of Gorike (4571746). Claim 4 analyzed with respect to claim 1, Redmer discloses, said first part so that said second and third parts press towards a position in proximity to said ears (col. 3 line 23-32) in order to hold said ear protector securely in a position such that said fourth and fifth parts, in the respective second position, fit said ear plugs into said auditory canals (col. 4 line 31-32, 37-39). Redmer in view of Sato does not disclose said part pretensioned by a spring.

Gorike discloses said part pretensioned by a spring (col. 4 line 4-6, Fig. 1 central parts 3 and 4). Therefore it would be obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Redmer's headband in view of Sato with the spring of Gorike in order to have a more flexible headband.

Claim 5 analyzed with respect to claim 1, Redmer in view of Sato discloses, in which said fourth and fifth parts are, in said second position, they exert a pressure inwards towards said auditory canal (Redmer; col. 3 line 23-32). Redmer in view of Sato do not disclose in which said fourth part and fifth parts are pretensioned by a spring.

Gorike discloses in which said parts are pretensioned by a spring (col. 4 line 4-10).

Therefore it would be obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Redmer's headband in view of Sato with the spring of Gorike in order to have a more flexible headband.

Claim 6 analyzed with respect to claim 1, Redmer in view of Sato discloses, said fourth and fifth parts in said second position so as to assume said first position under a slight pressure (Redmer; col. 3 line 23-32). Redmer in view of Sato does not disclose said fourth part and fifth part are pretensioned by a spring in said second position.

Gorike discloses said parts are pretensioned by a spring in said second position (col. 4 line 4-10, first and second positions: headphones on and off a user's head). Therefore it would be obvious to one ordinarily skilled in the art at the time the invention was made

to modify Redmer's headband in view of Sato with the spring of Gorike in order to have a more flexible headband.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fatimat O. Olaniran whose telephone number is 571-270-3437. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F Alt F off 8:30-6 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hai Tran can be reached on 571-272-7305. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

FO